

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1.) Claim Amendments

The Applicants have amended claims 1, 11, 20, 23 and 25; and claim 38 has been added. Accordingly, claims 1-2, and 4-38 are pending in the application. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

2.) Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 11, 12, 16/11, 16/12, 17-19, 24, 25, 27-29, 31, 32 and 34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Casarez, et al. (5,913,174) in view of Hayes, et al. (US 5,828,342). The Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 11 and 25 to better distinguish the claimed invention from Casarez and Hayes. Specifically, the feature "a common support element comprising a flexible dielectric film contained in a flexible housing" has been changed to "a common support element consisting of a flexible *thin* dielectric film *provided directly* in a flexible housing". Support for this change can be found at page 7, lines 13-18 and Figure 3 of the Specification. The aforementioned change is significant as Casarez and Hayes both disclose a substrate on a rigid, non-flexible support member, or alternatively that the support element is made of a material such as polyamide, polyester or the like—materials that are inherently not thin nor flexible. Specifically, Casarez discloses a removable planar antenna for a card radio. The antenna comprises a soft flexible cover attached to an inner surface of a mounting member. The antenna further comprises a flexible substrate laminated to rigid member (see column 6, lines 43-52). Casarez does not disclose a first and a second antenna, only one antenna. Therefore, the Examiner combined Casarez with Hayes. Hayes discloses a first and a second antenna provided on a flexible dielectric material, such as polyamide, polyester or the like (see column 4, lines 50-53). Thus, Casarez and Hayes, in combination, do not disclose nor suggest the present invention as claimed.

Claims 2, 4, 5 and 7 depend directly or indirectly from amended claim 1 and recite further limitations in combination with the novel elements of claim 1. Claims 12,

16/11, 16/12, 17-19, and 24 depend directly or indirectly from amended claim 11 and recite further limitations in combination with the novel elements of claim 11. Claims 27-29, 31, 32 and 34 depend directly or indirectly from amended claim 25 and recite further limitations in combination with the novel elements of claim 25. Therefore, the allowance of claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 11, 12, 16/11, 16/12, 17-19, 24, 25, 27-29, 31, 32 and 34 is respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejected claims 6, 8-10, 30 and 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Casarez in view of Hayes, and further in view of Korisch (5,926,139). The Applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 25, from which claims 6, 8-10, 30 and 33 depend to better distinguish the claimed invention from Casarez, Hayes and Korisch. Claims 6, 8-10 depend from amended claim 1 and recite further limitations in combination with the novel elements of claim 1. Claims 30 and 33 depend from amended claim 25 and recite further limitations in combination with the novel elements of claim 25. Therefore, the allowance of claims 6, 8-10, 30 and 33 is respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejected claims 13, 15, 16/15, 20, 22 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Casarez in view of Hayes, and further in view of Pankinaho (6,140,966). The Applicants have amended independent claims 11 and 20 from which claims 13, 15, 16/15, 22 and 23 depend to better distinguish the claimed invention from Casarez, Hayes and Pankinaho. Claims 13, 15, and 16/15 depend from amended claim 11 and recite further limitations in combination with the novel elements of claim 11. Claims 22 and 23 depend from amended claim 20 and recite further limitations in combination with the novel elements of claim 20. Therefore, the allowance of claims 13, 15, 16/15, 20, 22 and 23 is respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejected claims 14, 16/14 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Casarez in view of Hayes and Pankinaho, and further in view of Sciarretta, et al. (6,039,580). The Applicants have amended independent claims 11 and 20 from which claims 14, 16/14 and 21 depend to better distinguish the claimed invention from Casarez, Hayes, Pankinaho and Sciarretta. Claims 14 and 16/14 depend from amended claim 11 and recite further limitations in combination with the novel elements of claim 11. Claim 21 depends from amended claim 20 and recites

further limitations in combination with the novel elements of claim 20. Therefore, the allowance of claims 14, 16/14 and 21 is respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejected claim 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Casarez in view of Hayes, and further in view of Dietrich, et al. (5,552,798). The Applicants have amended independent claim 25 from which claim 26 depends to better distinguish the claimed invention from Casarez, Hayes and Dietrich. Claim 26 depends from amended claim 25 and recites further limitations in combination with the novel elements of claim 25. Therefore, the allowance of claim 26 is respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejected claims 35-37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Casarez in view of Hayes, and further in view of Olyphant, et al. (3,832,769). The Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 11 and 25 from which claims 35-37 depend to better distinguish the claimed invention from Casarez, Hayes and Olyphant. Claim 35 depends from amended claim 1 and recites further limitations in combination with the novel elements of claim 1. Claim 36 depends from amended claim 11 and recites further limitations in combination with the novel elements of claim 11. Claim 37 depends from amended claim 25 and recites further limitations in combination with the novel elements of claim 25. Therefore, the allowance of claims 35-37 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicants believe all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicants, therefore, respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for claims 1-2, and 4-38.

The Applicants request a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,

/Michael Cameron, #50,298/

Date: April 11, 2006

Michael Cameron
Registration No. 50,298

Ericsson Inc.
6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11
Plano, Texas 75024

(972) 583-4145
michael.cameron@ericsson.com